

Masashi TAKUBO, S.N. 10/766,724  
Page 11

Dkt. 2271/71526

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated December 11, 2007. Claims 1-12, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 are pending, with claims 13, 16 and 19 having previously been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. By this Amendment, claims 1-10 have been amended to clarify that the image data stored in the first storing mechanism which is inaccessible through the local area network represents a document image. The Examiner's interpretation of the claim term "image data" to include data pertaining to an image (but not necessarily representing an image) necessitated the enclosed claim amendment. On the other hand, such claim amendments merely clarify an issue discussed in the record to which the Examiner has given consideration and responded. Accordingly, applicant submits that the claim amendments do not introduce new matter or new issues and therefore entry of the claim amendments is requested. Upon entry of the claim amendments, claims 1-12, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 remaining pending for reconsideration, with claims 1-10 being in independent form.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,023,573 to Ohhashi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,107,395 to Ofek et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,958,005 to Thorne et al. Claims 2, 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek. Claims 3, 6, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek and further in view of Simpson et al. (US 20040036907 A1). Claims 10, 14, 15, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Ohhashi in view of Ofek and Thorne and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,698 to McBride.

Masashi TAKUBO, S.N. 10/766,724  
Page 12

Dkt. 2271/71526

It is indicated in the Office Action that the Examiner considers the claim term "image data" to include data pertaining to an image (but not necessarily representing an image).

Accordingly, applicant has amended each of independent claims to clarify that clarify that the image data stored in the first storing mechanism which is inaccessible through the local area network represents a document image.

Memory 23 in Fig. 7 of Ohhashi is equated in the Office Action with a first storing mechanism.

Ohhashi, as understood by applicant, proposes an image transmission device configured to compare image data from a scanned document image with sample data corresponding to one or more specific pre-registered documents (for example, paper money, valuable securities, etc.), in order to detect a forgery of such pre-registered documents.

As discussed in the record (see, for example, October 1, 2007 Amendment), the memory 23 in Fig. 7 of Ohhashi does not store image data. Ohhashi, column 12, lines 27-42, makes it clear that memory 23 is proposed in Ohhashi to be used for storing information indicating whether an activity of registering a specific document has been executed, and memory 23 is not for storing image data representing a document image.

Further, it is noted that Ohhashi does not otherwise render obvious the claimed subject matter, since Ohhashi is not concerned with determining whether the received document image data (representing the received document) is confidential.

The objective of Ohhashi is to detect forged documents, such as paper money and valuable securities, which generally are not confidential.

Ofek, as understood by applicant, proposes a configuration of data storage for computers wherein the storage elements are configured into a storage domain including a plurality of

Masashi TAKUBO, S.N. 10/766,724  
Page 13

Dkt. 2271/71526

primary storage devices and a secondary storage device, and the secondary storage device is coupled to the primary storage devices through a network to provide backup media for the host computers.

Ofek, like Ohhashi, does not disclose or suggest a first storing mechanism configured to store image data representing a document image and to be inaccessible through the local area network.

In addition, Ofek, like Ohhashi, is not concerned with whether specific stored image data is confidential. The backup mechanism proposed by Ofek does not make a determination as to whether the stored data is confidential, in the process of making a copy of the stored data for backup.

Thorne, as understood by Applicant, proposes a system for communicating e-mails between computers connected to a network, while providing selectable degrees of security for each message. A header of the e-mail specifies, in addition to the address of the intended destination, one or more security parameters (such as instructions for erasure of the data message following its storage in the recipient computer, instructions as to whether copying, archiving, forwarding and printing of the data message is permitted, etc.) which control the processing of the e-mail at the destination.

Fig. 3 of Thorne and the archiving function proposed in Thorne are referenced in the Office Action.

However, the archiving function proposed in Thorne, Fig. 3, is not contingent on the message being not confidential. Further, Thorne does not disclose or suggest that if an archive command is specified by the user, a determination of whether the message is confidential is made before the message is archived.

Masashi TAKUBO, S.N. 10/766,724  
Page 14

Dkt. 2271/71526

In addition, Thorne, like the other cited references, does not disclose or suggest a first storing mechanism configured to store image data representing a document image and to be inaccessible through the local area network.

Simpson, as understood by Applicant, proposes a system wherein a facsimile message is saved to a personal image repository as a facsimile image in a format compatible with multiple computer operating systems for use with an identity-based imaging system.

Simpson, like the other cited references, does not disclose or suggest a first storing mechanism configured to store image data representing a document image and to be inaccessible through the local area network.

In addition, the system proposed by Simpson does not make a determination regarding whether the facsimile message/image includes confidential data or not.

McBride, as understood by Applicant, proposes an approach for automatically synchronizing data from a host computer to two or more backup data storage locations.

McBride, like the other cited references, does not disclose or suggest a first storing mechanism configured to store image data representing a document image and to be inaccessible through the local area network.

In addition, the apparatus proposed by McBride does not make a determination regarding whether the data to be backed-up includes confidential data or not.

Accordingly, the combination of cited references do not disclose or suggest storing received document image data representing a document image into a first storing mechanism inaccessible through the local area network and a copy of the received document image data into a second storing mechanism accessible through the local area network, determining whether the received document image data is confidential, and canceling storing the copy of the received

Masashi TAKUBO, S.N. 10/766,724  
Page 15

Dkt. 2271/71526

document image data into the second storing mechanism when the received document image data is determined as confidential, as provided by the subject matter of claim 1 of the present application. Independent claims 4 and 7 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Likewise, the cited references fail to teach or suggest storing received document image data representing a received document image into a first storing mechanism inaccessible through the local area network and storing a copy of the received document image data into a second storing mechanism accessible through the local area network, determining whether the received document image data stored in the second storing mechanism is confidential upon a receipt of a data transmission request for transmitting the received document image data stored in the second storing mechanism, and refusing the data transmission request when the received document image data is determined as confidential, as provided by the subject matter of claim 2 of the present application. Independent claims 5 and 8 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

In addition, the cited references fail to teach or suggest storing received document image data representing a received document image into a first storing mechanism inaccessible through the local area network and storing a copy of the received document image data into a second storing mechanism accessible through the local area network, determining whether the received document image data stored in the second storing mechanism is confidential upon a receipt of a data transmission request for transmitting the received document image data stored in the second storing mechanism, and refusing the data transmission request when the received document image data is determined as confidential, as provided by the subject matter of claim 3 of the present application. Independent claims 6, 9 and 10 are patentably distinct from the cited art for

Masashi TAKUBO, S.N. 10/766,724  
Page 16

Dkt. 2271/71526

at least similar reasons.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837  
Attorney for Applicant  
Cooper & Dunham LLP  
Tel.: (212) 278-0400